UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,175	01/16/2002	Yoshiaki Watanabe	0879-0369P	2336

2292 7590 07/11/2008

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER	
PITARO, RYAN F	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/11/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/046,175	WATANABE, YOSHIAKI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	RYAN F. PITARO	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 November 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4/22/2007*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This action is in response the Amendment F filed 3/20/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1,22,28,29,31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobeski et al ("Sobeski", US 6,819,343) in view of Wassom et al ("Wassom", US 2002/0057298) in view of Takemoto ("Takemoto", US 6,335,742).

As per independent claim 1, Sobeski discloses client/server system comprising a plurality of computers connected to a network, wherein: a server on the network possesses button information which is data on menu buttons operating in connection with a client application introduced into a client computer wherein the server generates

customized updated button information and wherein the server has a function of transmitting the customized updated button information to the client computer (Column 5 line 64 – Column 6 line 18); and the client application comprises a program which causes the client computer to provide a function of communicating with the server to obtain the customized updated button information from the server (Column 5 line 36 – Column 6 line 18), a function of displaying menu buttons on a display in combination with a GUI screen of the client application according to the customized updated button information obtained (Column 5 lines 64-66, and a function of performing operations defined for the displayed menu buttons (Column 5 line 35 – Column 6 line 18; Column 10 line 13-25). Sobeski fails to distinctly point out updating button information based on a user's pre-stored personal information. However, Wassom teaches updating button information based on a user's pre-stored personal information ([0033]-[0035]) and performing the service associated with the menu button ([0033]-[0034]). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Wassom with the system of Sobeski. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a set of user interface controls corresponding to the identity of the user, so that a user can enjoy the benefits of a toolbar without the clutter of permanently disabled controls. Wassom-Sobeski fails to distinctly point out the client application for viewing images. However, Takemoto teaches an application for viewing a plurality of images, the image viewer including a window including a file list display section that displays a folder structure of the client computer (Figure 9, 400), an image list display section that list a reduced image of the images stored in a folder designated by a user

(Figure 9 500) and a menu display section that displays a list of a plurality of menu buttons, each of the plurality of menu buttons corresponding to a service (Figure 9 200). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Takemoto with the system of Wassom-Sobeski. Motivation to do so would have been to provide way to easily ascertain the contents of the respective files and easily be able to manipulate them.

Claim 22 is similar in scope to that of claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 28, Sobeski-Wassom-Takemoto teaches an apparatus connected to a network, comprising: a memory storing a set of instructions; and a processor to execute the stored set of instructions to perform a method comprising: accessing a server on the network (Sobeski, Column 5 line 64 – Column 6 line 18); obtaining button information from the server (Sobeski, Column 5 line 64 – Column 6 line 18) wherein the server generates the customized button information based on a user's pre-stored personal information (Wassom, [0033]-[0035]); displaying menu buttons on a display based on the obtained button information (Sobeski, Column 5 line 64 – Column 6 line 18), wherein the menu buttons are associated with pre-defined operations to be performed at the apparatus (Sobeski, Column 5 line 64 – Column 6 line 18).

As per claim 29, Sobeski-Wassom-Takemoto teaches an apparatus connected to a network, comprising; a memory for storing button information representing data on menu buttons for operation with an application executed on a client computer and a set of instructions; a processor to execute the stored set of instructions to perform a method comprising: receiving a request for button information to the client computer in response to the request (Column 5 line 64 – Column 6 line 18) generating customized updated button information based on a user's pre-stored personal information (Wassom, [0033]-[0035]); and transmitting the button information to the client computer in response to the request (Sobeski, Column 5 line 64 – Column 6 line 18).

As per claim 31, Sobeski-Wassom-Takemoto teaches the client/server system wherein each of the deliverable menu buttons registered in the server is described with conditions of the users to whom menus are to be transmitted (Wassom, [0033]), wherein the server checks the personal information of the user (Wassom, [0033]), who accesses the server using the client application, with the conditions of the users, to whom menus are to be transmitted descried for each button (Wassom, [0034]-[0035]), and determines the confirmed condition as a button to be distributed to the user (Wassom, [0033])

Claims 32, 33, and 34 are similar in scope to that of claim 31, and are therefore individually rejected under similar rationale.

3. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobeski et al ("Sobeski", US 6,819,343) and Wassom et al ("Wassom", US 2002/0057298) and Takemoto ("Takemoto", US 6,335,742) in view of Reha et al ("Reha", US 6,282,709).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Sobeski-Wassom-Takemoto teaches the client application transmits an update request to the server, and in response to the update request the server provides the customized updated button information to the client application (Sobeski, Column 10 lines 13-25). However, Sobeski-Wassom-Takemoto does not expressly disclose an actual update button. Reha does teach a GUI screen of the client application has an update button operated by a user to instruct the menu buttons to be updated (Reha, Column 7 lines 21-27). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Reha with the system of Sobeski-Wassom. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a simple way of letting the users of Sobeski-Wassom to update the menu and button information when requesting to do so.

4. Claims 11,17,21,23,25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobeski et al ("Sobeski", US 6,819,343) and Wassom et al ("Wassom", US 2002/0057298) and Takemoto ("Takemoto", US 6,335,742) and Reha et al ("Reha", US 6,282,709) in view of Shima et al ("Shima", US 6,295,479).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, Sobeski-Wassom-Takemoto-Reha teach menu and button updates but fail to expressly teach the specifics of the button parameters. However, Shima teaches a system wherein the button information includes button IDs as unique identification codes defined for the menu buttons (Shima, Column 14 lines 22-34), condition flags used to determine whether the menu buttons are enabled or disabled (Shima, Column 14 lines 35-56), action types which are condition flags used to determine operation of the menu buttons, and information used to identify images of the menu buttons (Shima, Column 14 lines 35-56). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the parameters of Shima with the modified system of Sobeski. Motivation to do so would have been to establish a common list of parameters, which distinctly define the buttons from each other.

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 11, Sobeski-Wassom-Takemoto-Reha-Shima teaches the GUI screen of the client application has an update button operated by a user to instruct the menu buttons to be updated (Reha, Column 7 lines 21-27); and when the update button is operated, the client application transmits an update request to the server, and in response to the update request the server provides the customized updated button information to the client application (Sobeski, Column 10 lines 13 –25).

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 11, Sobeski-Wassom-Takemoto-Reha-Shima teaches a system wherein the server transmits list information on button

IDs of new menu buttons to be incorporated based on the customized updated button information to the client application which has requested the menu buttons to be updated (Reha, Column 9 lines 33-43), to the client application which has requested the current menu buttons to be updated (Sobeski, Column 10 lines 13-25); upon receiving the list information on button IDs, the client application compares the button IDs described in the list information with the button IDs in the button information saved in a storage device of the client computer, and requests the server to obtain the button information on the button IDs described in the list information only if these button IDs are different from the button IDs in the button information (Reha, Column 9 lines 33-65); and the server transmits the customized updated button information on the requested button IDs to the client application (Sobeski, Column 5 line 35 – Column 6 line 18; Reha, Column 9 lines 33-65;).

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 22, Sobeski-Wassom-Takemoto-Reha-Shima teaches a system wherein the button information includes button IDs as unique identification codes defined for the menu buttons (Shima, Column 14 lines 22-34), condition flags used to determine whether the menu buttons are enabled or disabled (Shima, Column 14 lines 35-56), action types which are condition flags used to determine operation of the menu buttons, and information used to identify images of the menu buttons (Shima, Column 14 lines 35-56); the server transmits, to the client application which has requested the menu buttons to be updated (Sobeski, Column 5 line 35 – Column 6 line 18), list information on button IDs of new menu buttons to be

incorporated based on the customized updated button (Reha, Column 9 lines 33-43), to the client application which has requested the current menu buttons to be updated (Sobeski, Column 10 lines 13-25); upon receiving the list information on button IDs, the client application compares the button IDs described in the list information with the button IDs in the button information saved in a storage device of the client computer, and requests the server to obtain the button information on the button IDs described in the list information only if these button IDs are different from the button IDs in the button information (Reha, Column 9 lines 33-65); and the server transmits the button information on the requested button IDs to the client application (Sobeski, Column 5 line 35 – Column 6 line 18; Reha, Column 9 lines 33-65).

As per claim 25, which is dependent on claim 24, Sobeski-Wassom-Takemoto-Reha-Shima teaches a system wherein the button information includes button IDs as unique identification codes defined for the menu buttons (Shima, Column 14 lines 22-34), condition flags used to determine whether the menu buttons are enabled or disabled (Shima, Column 14 lines 35-56), action types which are condition flags used to determine operation of the menu buttons, and information used to identify images of the menu buttons (Shima, Column 14 lines 35-56); the server transmits, to the client application which has requested the menu buttons to be updated (Sobeski, Column 5 line 35 – Column 6 line 18), list information on button IDs of new menu buttons to be incorporated based on the customized updated button (Reha, Column 9 lines 33-43) , to the client application which has requested the current menu buttons to be updated

(Sobeski, Column 10 lines 13-25) ; upon receiving the list information on button IDs, the client application compares the button IDs described in the list information with the button IDs in the button information saved in a storage device of the client computer, and requests the server to obtain the customized updated button information on the button IDs described in the list information only if these button IDs are different from the button IDs in the button information (Reha, Column 9 lines 33-65); and the server transmits the button information on the requested button IDs to the client application (Sobeski, Column 5 line 35 – Column 6 line 18; Reha, Column 9 lines 33-65).

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 1, Sobeski-Reha-Shima discloses the system wherein the server automatically determines the customized updated button information to send to the client application (Reha, Column 9 lines 52-65).

Claim 27 is similar in scope to that of claim 26, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobeski et al ("Sobeski", US 6,819,343) and Wassom et al ("Wassom", US 2002/0057298) and Takemoto ("Takemoto", US 6,334,742) in view of Manolis et al ("Manolis", US 6,583,799).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Sobeski-Wassom-Takemoto fails to disclose the application comprising an image viewer with a browsing function. However, Manolis teaches a system wherein: the client application comprises an image

viewer which causes the client computer to provide an image transmitting and receiving function and an image browsing function (Figure 9); and the menu buttons are image transmitting GUI buttons for which a destination of an image is set (Figure 9; *upload and browse*). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the system of Sobeski-Wassom-Takemoto with the teaching of Manolis. Motivation to do so would have been a design choice since the environment of the menu does not affect the functionality of the personalized interface.

As per claim 30, Sobeski-Wasson-Takemoto-Manolis teaches at least one of the menu buttons performs operations relating to image processing services (Manolis, Column 10 lines 9-26).

6. Claim14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobeski et al ("Sobeski", US 6,819,343) and Wassom et al ("Wassom", US 2002/0057298) and Takemoto("Takemoto", US 6,335,742) and Reha et al ("Reha", US 6,282,709) and Shima et al ("Shima", US 6,295,479) and Brennan et al ("Brennan", US 2002/0077829) in view of Manolis et al ("Manolis", US 6,583,799).

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 12, the modified Sobeski fails to disclose the application comprising an image viewer with a browsing function. However, Manolis teaches a system wherein: the client application comprises an image viewer which causes the client computer to provide an image transmitting and receiving function and an image browsing function (Figure 9); and the menu buttons are image

transmitting GUI buttons for which a destination of an image is set (Figure 9; *upload and browse*). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the system of modified Sobeski with the teaching of Manolis. Motivation to do so would have been a design choice since the environment of the menu does not affect the functionality of the personalized interface.

7. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobeski et al ("Sobeski", US 6,819,343) and Wassom et al ("Wassom", US 2002/0057298) and Takemoto ("Takemoto", US 6,335,742) and Reha et al ("Reha", US 6,282,709) and Shima et al ("Shima", US 6,295,479) in view of Manolis et al ("Manolis", US 6,583,799).

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 11, modified Sobeski fails to disclose the application comprising an image viewer with a browsing function. However, Manolis teaches a system wherein: the client application comprises an image viewer which causes the client computer to provide an image transmitting and receiving function and an image browsing function (Figure 9); and the menu buttons are image transmitting GUI buttons for which a destination of an image is set (Figure 9; *upload and browse*). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the system of modified Sobeski with the teaching of Manolis. Motivation to

do so would have been a design choice since the environment of the menu does not affect the functionality of the personalized interface.

8. Claims 4,5,6,9,10,24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobeski et al ("Sobeski", US 6,819,343) and Wassom et al ("Wassom", US 2002/0057298) and Takemoto ("Takemoto", US 6,335,742) in view of Brennan et al ("Brennan", US 2002/0077829).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Sobeski-Wassom-Takemoto teaches a personalization system, but does not distinctly point out specifically storing and distributing the information. However, Brennan discloses a system wherein: the server comprises: a database which stores personal information on users who activate the client application to access the server ([0033] lines 6-11); and a distribution button determining device which determines contents of the customized updated button information to be distributed to the users on the basis of the users' personal information ([0034] lines 13-14); and the button information on the menu buttons determined by the distribution button determining device is delivered to the client application ([0033] lines 24-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the interface personalization system of Brennan with the system of Sobeski-

Wassom-Takemoto. Motivation to do so would have been to tailor an interface to a user so that unwanted elements are not included making the interface simpler.

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, modified Sobeski discloses a system wherein: the personal information on the users is registered in the database using an online user registering function of the client application (Brennan, [0033] lines 4-6); upon registration, each user is provided with a user ID which is a unique identification code (Brennan, Figure 3; *access number)*; and subsequent requests from the client application to the server are provided with the user ID so as to authenticate the user ID (Brennan, [0033] lines 4-6;*authentication procedure*).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, S modified Sobeski discloses a system wherein: an effective start date and time and an effective end date and time are set as parameters for the customized updated button information (Brennan, [0029] lines 1-5); and the client application provides a function of displaying the menu buttons only during this period (Brennan, [0029] lines 1-5).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 6, modified Sobeski discloses a system wherein: the server comprises: a database which stores personal information on users who activate the client application to access the server (Brennan, [0033] lines 6-11); and a distribution button determining device which determines contents of the customized upsated button information to be distributed to the users on the basis of the

users' personal information (Brennan, [0034] lines 13-14); and the customized updated button information on the menu buttons determined by the distribution button determining device is delivered to the client application (Brennan, [0033] lines 24-28).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 9, modified Sobeski discloses a system wherein: the personal information on the users is registered in the database using an online user registering function of the client application (Brennan, [0033] lines 4-6); upon registration, each user is provided with a user ID which is a unique identification code (Brennan, Figure 3; *access number)*; and subsequent requests from the client application to the server are provided with the user ID so as to authenticate the user ID (Brennan, [0033] lines 4-6;*authentication procedure*).

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 22, modified Sobeski teaches a personalization system, but does not distinctly point out specifically storing and distributing the information. However, Brennan discloses a system wherein: the server comprises: a database which stores personal information on users who activate the client application to access the server ([0033] lines 6-11); and a distribution button determining device which generates the customized updated button information to be distributed to the users on the basis of the users' personal information ([0034] lines 13-14); and the customized updated button information on the menu buttons determined by the distribution button determining device is delivered to the client application ([0033] lines 24-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the

invention to combine the interface personalization system of Brennan with the system of Sobeski-Wassom. Motivation to do so would have been to tailor an interface to a user so that unwanted elements are not included making the interface simpler.

9. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobeski et al ("Sobeski", US 6,819,343) and Wassom et al ("Wassom", US 2002/0057298) and Takemoto ("Takemoto", US 6,335,742) in view of Brennan et al ("Brennan", US 2002/0077829) in view of Reha et al ("Reha", US 6,282,709).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, modified Sobeski teaches the client application transmits an update request to the server, and in response to the update request the server provides the button information to the client application (Sobeski, Column 10 lines 13-25). However, modified Sobeski does not expressly disclose an actual update button. Reha does teach a GUI screen of the client application has an update button operated by a user to instruct the menu buttons to be updated (Reha, Column 7 lines 21-27). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Reha with the system of

modified Sobeski. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a simple way of letting the users of Sobeski to update the menu and button information when requesting to do so.

10. Claims 12,13,15,16,19,20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobeski et al ("Sobeski", US 6,819,343) and Wassom et al ("Wassom", US 2002/0057298) and Takemoto ("Takemoto", US 6,335,742) and Reha et al ("Reha", US 6,282,709) and Shima et al ("Shima", US 6,295,479) in view of Brennan et al ("Brennan", US 2002/0077829).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, modified Sobeski fails to disclose an effective end and start time. However, Brennan discloses a system wherein: an effective start date and time and an effective end date and time are set as parameters for the customized updated button information (Brennan, [0029] lines 1-5); and the client application provides a function of displaying the menu buttons only during this period (Brennan, [0029] lines 1-5). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the interface personalization system of Brennan with the system of modified Sobeski. Motivation to do so would have been to tailor an interface to a user so that unwanted elements are not included, making the interface simpler.

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 12, modified Sobeski teaches the GUI screen of the client application has an update button operated by a user to instruct the menu buttons to be updated (Reha, Column 7 lines 21-27); and when the update button is operated, the client application transmits an update request to the server, and in response to the update request the server provides the customized updated button information to the client application (Sobeski, Column 10 lines 13-25).

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 12, modified Sobeski discloses a system wherein: the server comprises: a database which stores personal information on users who activate the client application to access the server (Brennan, [0033] lines 6-11); and a distribution button determining device which determines contents of the customized updated button information to be distributed to the users on the basis of the users' personal information (Brennan, [0034] lines 13-14); and the customized updated button information on the menu buttons determined by the distribution button determining device is delivered to the client application (Brennan, [0033] lines 24-28).

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, modified Sobeski discloses a system wherein: the personal information on the users is registered in the database using an online user registering function of the client application (Brennan, [0033] lines 4-6); upon registration, each user is provided with a user ID which is a unique identification code (Brennan, Figure 3; *access number)*; and subsequent requests from

the client application to the server are provided with the user ID so as to authenticate the user ID (Brennan, [0033] lines 4-6;*authentication procedure*).

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 11, modified Sobeski teaches a personalization system, but does not distinctly point out specifically storing and distributing the information. However, Brennan discloses a system wherein: the server comprises: a database which stores personal information on users who activate the client application to access the server ([0033] lines 6-11); and a distribution button determining device which determines contents of the menu buttons to be distributed to the users on the basis of the users' personal information ([0034] lines 13-14); and the button information on the menu buttons determined by the distribution button determining device is delivered to the client application ([0033] lines 24-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the interface personalization system of Brennan with the system of modified Sobeski. Motivation to do so would have been to tailor an interface to a user so that unwanted elements are not included making the interface simpler.

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 19, modified Sobeski discloses a system wherein: the personal information on the users is registered in the database using an online user registering function of the client application (Brennan, [0033] lines 4-6); upon registration, each user is provided with a user ID which is a unique identification code (Brennan, Figure 3; *access number)*; and subsequent requests from

the client application to the server are provided with the user ID so as to authenticate the user ID (Brennan, [0033] lines 4-6;*authentication procedure*).

11. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobeski et al ("Sobeski", US 6,819,343) and Wassom et al ("Wassom", US 2002/0057298) and Takemoto ("Takemoto", US 6,335,742) and Brennan et al ("Brennan", US 2002/0077829) in view of Manolis et al ("Manolis", US 6,583,799).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 6, modified Sobeski fails to disclose the application comprising an image viewer with a browsing function. However, Manolis teaches a system wherein: the client application comprises an image viewer which causes the client computer to provide an image transmitting and receiving function and an image browsing function (Figure 9); and the menu buttons are image transmitting GUI buttons for which a destination of an image is set (Figure 9; *upload and browse*). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the system of modified Sobeski with the teaching of Manolis. Motivation to do so would have been a design choice since the environment of the menu does not affect the functionality of the personalized interface.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RYAN F. PITARO whose telephone number is (571)272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am - 5:30pm Mondays through Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. F. P./
Art Unit 2174

/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178